

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
2 Acting United States Attorney
3 LAURA JEAN BERGER
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
6 Fresno, CA 93721
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4000
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
11 United States of America

12
13
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 BRIAN ZAMORA,

20 Defendant.

21 CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00140-NONE-SKO

22 STIPULATION TO CONTINUE STATUS
23 CONFERENCE AND EXCLUDE TIME;
24 FINDINGS AND ORDER

25 DATE: May 5, 2021

26 TIME: 1:00 p.m.

27 COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

28 This case is set for status conference on May 5, 2021. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further notice.” Further, pursuant to General Order 611, this Court’s declaration of judicial emergency under U.S.C. § 3174, and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council’s Order of April 16, 2020 continuing this Court’s judicial emergency, this Court has allowed district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after May 2, 2021.¹ This and previous General Orders, as well as the declarations of judicial emergency, were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

29 Although the General Orders and declarations of emergency address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record

30 _____
31 ¹ A judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” at the discretion of that judge “or upon the request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020).

1 findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-
2 record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such
3 failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153
4 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit
5 findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

6 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory
7 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 and the subsequent declaration of judicial
8 emergency require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the
9 judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such
10 action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C.
11 § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of
12 the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of
13 such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

14 The General Orders and declaration of judicial emergency exclude delay in the “ends of justice.”
15 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7). The Government’s position is that although the Speedy Trial Act does not
16 directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this
17 Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit
18 affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United*
19 *States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the
20 trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)
21 (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant
22 public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt
23 proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

24 In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding
25 excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7).²
26 If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*,

27
28 ² The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make
“additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.
Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in
2 time”).

3 **STIPULATION**

4 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and
5 through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

6 1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on May 5, 2021.

7 2. By this stipulation, the parties now move to continue the status conference until June 30,
8 2021, and to exclude time between May 5, 2021, and June 30, 2021, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A),
9 B(iv).

10 3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

11 a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case
12 includes investigative reports and lengthy video footage. All of this discovery has been either
13 produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

14 b) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to further review discovery, discuss
15 potential resolution with her client and the government, and investigate and prepare for trial.

16 c) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested
17 continuance would deny her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
18 account the exercise of due diligence.

19 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

20 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
21 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
22 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

23 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
24 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of May 5, 2021 to June 30, 2021,
25 inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) because it results
26 from a continuance granted by the Court at the parties’ request on the basis of the Court’s finding
27 that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and
28 the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: April 29, 2021

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
Acting United States Attorney

/s/ LAURA JEAN BERGER
LAURA JEAN BERGER
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: April 29, 2021

/s/ CHRISTINA CORCORAN
CHRISTINA CORCORAN
Counsel for Defendant
BRIAN ZAMORA

FINDINGS AND ORDER

DATED: 4/29/2021

/s/ SHEILA K. OBERTO

THE HONORABLE SHEILA K. OBERTO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE